

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 47-84 will have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 85-95 will have been added for consideration by the Examiner. Thus, claims 85-95 currently remain pending. No new matter has been added. Regarding the newly added claims, Applicants note that claim 85 is generally based on claims 47-51; claim 86 is generally based on claim 53; claim 87 is generally based on claim 54; claim 88 is generally based on claim 56; claim 89 is generally based on claim 60; claim 90 is generally based on claim 69; claim 91 is generally based on claim 72; claim 92 is generally based on claim 75; claim 93 is generally based on claim 81; claim 94 is generally based on claim 83; and claim 95 is generally based on claim 84.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 47-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. By the present amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 47-80 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection has been rendered moot. Applicants note that newly submitted claims 85-95 are tied to a particular apparatus, such as, for example, a terminal apparatus, and are therefore directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a)**

Claims 47-59 and 69-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Muntz et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0208681); and claims 60-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muntz in view of Lowe et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0267693).

As noted above, claims 47-84 have been canceled by this amendment, and have been replaced with new claims 85-95. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 85-95 are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Regarding independent claim 85, Applicants note that this claim recites the features of a method for controlling a terminal apparatus, the terminal apparatus being connected to a network, the network including a content distribution server, a metadata distribution server, a license management server and an authentication server. The content distribution server stores content and a content provider ID. The metadata distribution server stores metadata that is used for supplementing the content and includes a metadata signer ID. The metadata signer ID indicates a signer that digitally signs the metadata. The license management server stores usage control information for the content and the metadata. The usage control information includes signer identification information that identifies a range of a provider that is permitted to provide the metadata to the terminal apparatus. The authentication server receives from one of the content distribution server and the metadata distribution server a request for a generation of a public key certificate, generates a subject ID indicating the one of the content distribution server and the metadata distribution server that transmits the request to the authentication server, generates a digital sign for the subject ID, and generates the public key certificate including the subject ID and the digital sign. The public key certificate also includes a certificate signer ID that identifies a signer that digitally signs the public key certificate. The method comprises: receiving, at the terminal apparatus, the content and the content provider ID stored in the content distribution server; receiving, at the terminal apparatus from the license management server, the usage control information; receiving, at the terminal apparatus from the metadata distribution server, the metadata; receiving, at the terminal apparatus, the public key certificate generated by the authentication server; judging, at the terminal apparatus, whether the received content

provider ID matches the metadata signer ID included in the metadata, when the range included in the usage control information indicates i) the content distribution server or ii) the content distribution server and the metadata distribution server that is authorized by the content distribution server; judging, at the terminal apparatus, whether the received content provider ID matches the certificate signer ID included in the public key certificate, when it is judged that the content provider ID does not match the metadata signer ID; and determining, at the terminal apparatus, that the metadata is available to the terminal apparatus, i) when it is judged that the content provider ID matches the metadata signer ID or ii) when it is judged that the content provider ID matches the certificate signer ID.

Independent claim 93 recites a related terminal apparatus, independent claim 94 recites a related system, and independent claim 95 recites a related computer-readable recording medium.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied prior art references do not teach or suggest the above-noted combination of features recited in the pending claims.

Regarding the Muntz reference, Applicants note that Muntz discloses a method for enforcing file authorization access. The method disclosed in Muntz comprises generating an authorization combination at a metadata server and encrypting the authorization combination (see paragraph [0004]). The authorization combination includes a block combination including a block list for accessing user requested data from a storage server system and an authorization prefix, wherein the authorization prefix indicates one operation which the user requesting data access is authorized to perform (see paragraph [0004]).

However, Muntz fails to disclose a method for controlling a terminal apparatus connected to a network including a license management server, the license management server storing usage control information for the content and the metadata, the usage control information

including signer identification information that identifies a range of a provider that is permitted to provide the metadata to the terminal apparatus, the method comprising judging, at the terminal apparatus, whether the received content provider ID matches the metadata signer ID included in the metadata, when the range included in the usage control information indicates i) the content distribution server or ii) the content distribution server and the metadata distribution server that is authorized by the content distribution server. In particular, Muntz does not contain disclosure regarding, at least, signer identification information that identifies a range of a provider that is permitted to provide the metadata to the terminal apparatus. Thus, Muntz fails to disclose judging whether the received content provider ID matches the metadata signer ID included in the metadata, when the range included in the usage control information indicates i) the content distribution server or ii) the content distribution server and the metadata distribution server that is authorized by the content distribution server.

For the above reasons, Muntz also fails to disclose a method for controlling a terminal apparatus, the method comprising judging, at the terminal apparatus, whether the received content provider ID matches the certificate signer ID included in the public key certificate, when it is judged that the content provider ID does not match the metadata signer ID.

For the above reasons, Muntz further fails to disclose a method for controlling a terminal apparatus, the method comprising determining, at the terminal apparatus, that the metadata is available to the terminal apparatus, i) when it is judged that the content provider ID matches the metadata signer ID or ii) when it is judged that the content provider ID matches the certificate signer ID.

Thus, the pending claims are clearly distinguished over Muntz. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Lowe reference fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Muntz.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the features recited in independent claims

85 and 93-95 are not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the applied art of record. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 85 and 93-95, as well as all claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Satoshi NIWANO et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2009.03.04 16:51:02 -05'00'

Kenneth W. Fields

Registration No. 52,430

Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

March 4, 2009